2:Newcomb E-4, 5 (1951-1952) 1956
NM7 Delaware NM7

727

They cut and slash them alive, cutting off their ears, their noses, their tongues, and their lips, and also their fingers and toes; they also cut off pieces of flesh from different parts of their bodies, and then they strew ashes over the wounds in order to prevent the blood from flowing.[180]

Charles Stuart, captured in the mid-eighteenth century, recounted the torture, motivated by revenge, through which he was to go. It bears a striking resemblance to Holm's account:

The Deaths we were to Suffer were as Follows, First our Fingers were To be Cut off and we were To Be Forced to eat them, then our Eyes pulld out w^ch we were also to Eat, after w^ch we were To Be Put on a Scaffold and Burnt, the Manner of Scaffolding is first To Tie Them To a Post or Tree with so much Length of Rope as will allow them ab^t 3 Foot to move about the Tree, then they raise them a little from the Ground on a Logg or what Else happens to be Most Convenient to Set them on then Puts Wood about them and burns them up-After the Council in Gen^l had agreed To Put us to this Death.[181]

Colonel William Crawford, who was tortured to death by the Delawares, underwent more or less the same rigors.[182] In general, torture was prolonged as long as was possible and was motivated entirely by revenge, particularly so in a case like Crawford's, since he had with him on his expedition men responsible for the Gnadenhutten massacre. Captives who escaped and were recaptured probably suffered the most ingenious tortures.[183]

727
547

Prisoners were adopted if they were not killed. One late source stated that a family might request a leader of a war party to bring back "a prisoner who shall fill the place of some deceased relative." Trowbridge went on to say that "in the adoption of prisoners no particular distinction is made on account of age, save that the person adopted must be youthful to supply the place of a son or daughter, and aged for a father or uncle."[184] According to Zeisberger, if white prisoners were intended for adoption, their hair was cut Indian fashion immediately after capture and their faces were painted red. These adopted individuals were well treated, but if they ran away they were liable to be tortured and killed.[185]

727

Prisoners were forced to run the gauntlet, whether they were to be killed or adopted. When the returning warriors approached a village, Indian prisoners were forced to dance while the warriors paraded booty and red painted scalps on poles. For white prisoners the dance was apparently not held.[186] The prisoners were made to pass through two lines of the general multitude to a hut or a painted post.[187] The men, women, and children were equipped with axes, sticks, clubs, and whatever else came to hand and would attempt to strike the prisoner as he passed by. Charles Stuart, who "ran the gauntlet," went through what is probably a typical experience:

[180]Holm, p. 138.
[181]Stuart, 1926, pp. 61-62.
[182]Butterfield, 1883, p. 293.
[183]Schweinitz, 1905, p. 410.
[184]Trowbridge MS.
[185]Zeisberger, 1910, p. 106.
[186]*Ibid.*, p. 105; Trowbridge MS.
[187]Zeisberger, 1910, p. 105.

3:Zeisberger M-5 (1767-1780)1910
NM7 Delaware NM7

The children have entirely their own will and never do anything by compulsion. Told to do something they do not care about, the children let it go by default and are not reprimanded for it. Yet many wellbred children are found among them who pay great attention and respect to parents and do things to please them. They are courteous, even to strangers. They respond to mild treatment. The contrary generally produces bitterness, hatred and contempt. The women are frequently guilty of thus raising their children to anger, for the women are often ill-tempered. By way of punishment, they will pour water on the children or thrust them into the water. The parents are careful not to beat their children, lest the children might remember it and revenge themselves on some future occasion. Instances are not wanting where children when grown have reproached their parents for corporal punishment received in youth and have threatened to return the indignity.

Rarely does an Indian have two or more wives, being fearful of strife in the house. Blood relations do not marry; in this particular they are even more strict than the whites. They claim that division of the race into tribes came about in order to make it more readily certain that a man in taking a wife was not marrying a near relative. Concerning the tribes, however, more will be said in another connection. An instance of an Indian having married a mother and her daughter at the same time was a most extraordinary thing.

Families have from four to six children. More than this number is unusual. Birth of twins is rarely heard of. In many cases children who have become motherless after birth have been reared by careful old women. Sometimes children are given to such women. Then they spare no pains in rearing them. Soup made of Indian corn, pounded very fine, is given by them to infants of tender age, that may have come into their possession. Ordinarily, orphans, even if they have lost but the mother, meet with hard experience and often suffer want. Children who have been given or bequeathed, on the contrary, are almost without exception well cared for.

In the management of household affairs the husband leaves

3:Zeisberger M-5 (1767-1780)1910
NM7 Delaware NM7

a man he must secure a prisoner in his place. Should he lose more than one, responsibility weighs the more heavily upon him, and in default of showing an equal number of prisoners, his authority is at an end and he dare not think of continuing in the office. If an Indian loses his son, or one of his near relatives in war, whom he has highly valued, he gives a belt of wampum to a captain and desires him to go and take a prisoner to supply the place of the deceased. He takes his company into the enemy's country, and if he is fortunate in his exploit, immediately hangs the belt around the prisoner's neck to denote that he shall be received into a family and that his life is safe. Upon delivering the prisoner to his employer, the captain receives the belt as a reward, and the prisoner is adopted by the family as a son or near relative. But if he is unsuccessful or has been so unfortunate as to lose a man, the captain's standing is destroyed and he is disgraced. It depends, therefore, in large degree upon good fortune whether a man becomes or remains captain. There are never very many captains in one tribe, but always some.

Although a chief is not supposed to have much to do with war, his influence tends greatly either to prevent or encourage the commencement of a war, for the Indians believe that a war cannot be successful without the consent of the chief, and the captains endeavor on that account to live in harmony with him. It is not a light matter for the Indians to begin a war, as it might be among the Europeans, for a war having been begun it is not easy to bring it to an end nor to be reconciled to the enemies. The chief reason for this is that a certain number are killed on both sides and these, according to ancient custom, must be replaced by prisoners. War with the whites is a different matter, for the Indians usually secure more than enough of scalps and prisoners to make up their losses, and they may sue for peace at any time even while continuing hostilities. But with the nations of their own color they cannot do this, for they know that they will be punished by enemies who will avenge themselves in the cruelest manner.

The warriors consist of the young men, among whom, however, are those of fifty years and over. The warriors are under

| | | |

9: Kinietz E-4, 5 (1938) 1946
NM7 Delaware NM7

861 classes and text books were not a basic part of the system, but the descriptions of the teaching of Indian children show that they were definitely educated to fill their places in the society of which they were members. At a very early age children were given as
868 toys models of implements they would use in earnest in later life.
867 These were different for each sex. For example, a boy would be given a tiny bow with straws for arrows; then, as he grew up, the size and effectiveness of the weapons would be increased until he was able to kill every sort of game as a full-fledged hunter. Girls were given dolls and very early instructed in the fundamentals of making baskets and pots. A considerable amount of the instruction given to children was by example and explanation incidental to actual practices by the parents or other elders, and by the relation of stories and myths. Therein lies the explanation of the failure of many early writers to find a "system" of education among the Indians. As a matter of fact, the reports of the age at which childhood was considered to cease show that the training of youths among the Indians was completed while they were still quite young (106).

597 Johnston and Chipps definitely stated that orphaned children were never adopted by relatives, although the care of orphans usually devolved upon the nearest relations in the absence of adoption (107-12). Zeisberger's statement that orphans were often given or bequeathed to old women may be construed the same way. Among the sources only Pipe gave relatives a prior claim on orphans. He said that maternal grandparents were bound by custom to take care of children on the death of the parents, but that, if they too were dead, other relatives or friends might take them. All of the modern informants agree that relatives of orphans could and did adopt them, although childless friends or neighbors who desired them often were given the orphans if they made their desires known. From the available information it looks as if there was a change in customs regarding the adoption of orphans within the fourth period.

854 The cradleboard must have been discarded by the Delaware
352 early in the fourth period, for of the modern informants not even the oldest had ever seen one in use among the Delaware

9: Kinietz E-4, 5 (1938) 1946
NM7 Delaware NM7

CAPTAIN PIPE—In the days of yore children were considered as bound to obey their parents, and were not suffered to marry until the age of thirty if males or twenty-four if females; but to use their own language, they have so degenerated that in these days, when a boy begins to grow hoarse he assumes the practices of a man, declares himself independent and marries. 884

CAPTAIN CHIPPS—At the age of 12, children cease to be such. They are considered young men, but are subject to the usual family punishments for offenses, until they become of age.

E. R.—Childhood generally considered to end at 14 to 15 years of age but in backward cases was later.

W. L.—About 20 years of age depending on individual.

107. Adoption of children by near relatives

ZEISBERGER—In many cases children who have become motherless after birth have been reared by careful old women. Sometimes children are given to such women. Then they spare no pains in rearing them. Soup made of Indian corn, pounded very fine, is given by them to infants of tender age, that may have come into their possession. Ordinarily, orphans, even if they have lost but the mother, meet with hard experience and often suffer want. Children who have been given or bequeathed, on the contrary, are almost without exception well cared for. 597 [853]

JOHN JOHNSTON—They are not [adopted by near relatives], but when they adopt it is from a family that is not connected and when adopted are considered members of the family that they are adopted into. On death of parents care of child devolves upon nearest relation.

CAPTAIN PIPE—Orphans and sometimes neglected children, are often adopted by good men in the nation, and are in such case considered as the children of the adopting person subject to the same privileges which his own children enjoy. In case of the death of the parents, the maternal grandfather or mother is bound by custom to take the children under protection; but if they also be dead the children are adopted by such relatives or friends as may be inclined to take charge of them.

9: Kinietz E-4, 5 (1938) 1946
NM7 Delaware NM7

597 CAPTAIN CHIPPS—Children are never adopted by their relatives—adoption is confined to those who have been taken prisoners. If both parents die the charge of the children devolves on the nearest relative. Orphans are not provided for—but seldom suffer, and it is considered "a good thing" to administer to their wants.

J. W.—Orphan taken care of by some one close to orphan or family—some one who knows about it and has watched it—is given the orphan to raise in preference to a near relative. Some one who has heard of the child's predicament is given the child if he makes his wishes known.

113. Control of parents over mature children

885 JOHN JOHNSTON—They [parents] do [have control over mature children] for they consider them better able to receive the counsels of the parents.

CAPTAIN PIPE—Parental feelings are very strong and generally continue during life, in consequence of which, aged relatives consider it their duty to advise the young and deter them from the commission of wrong. But no compulsory means are used after their arrival at years of discretion.

CAPTAIN CHIPPS—Attachment of parents to children continues through life. And parental authority is exercised at all ages.

E. R.—Children stayed under supervision of parents even after they were married and until first child was born. After that they might ask for advice but it was seldom given otherwise.

W. L.—Parents exercise control over children until they are married. (He was adopted by paternal grandparents when he was about 22 years of age.)

115. Daily bath given child

854 JOHN JOHNSTON—for one year.

[863] J. W.—for five years.

W. T.—for four years.

E. R.—twice daily for ten days, then daily for three to four months.

W. L.—for four to five years.